

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/657,114	TSAI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Tuan A Vu	2124	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Tuan A Vu. (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Ken Berner. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 26 January 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner has suggested that the late amendments to the specifications cause additional semantic informalities to what had been previously objected to ( e.g. grammatical errors) in an earlier office action. During the interview it was shown that instead of deleting some paragraphs to overcome those objections, the best alternative is to maintain those deleted paragraphs and address the minor errors which are the cause of the objections. It was then agreed to resinsert the deleted parts and fix the grammatical informalities therein so to avoid additional semantic problems..